

# THE RICHMOND DISPATCH.

## BY THE DISPATCH COMPANY

The DAILY DISPATCH is delivered to subscribers at FIFTEEN CENTS per week, payable to the carrier weekly. Mailed at \$6 per annum; \$3 for six months; \$1.50 for three months; 50c for one month. Prices per copy, 5 cents.

The WEEKLY DISPATCH at \$4 per annum.

The SUNDAY DISPATCH at \$1.50 per annum, or 75 cents for six months.

Subscriptions in all cases payable in advance, and no paper continued after the expiration of the time paid for. Send post-office money order, check, or registered letter. Currency sent by mail will be at the risk of the sender. Subscribers wishing their post-office changed must give their old as well as their new post-office. Sample copies free.

### ADVERTISING RATES.

HALF INCH OR LESS.	
1 time	50
2 times	1.00
3 times	1.50
4 times	2.00
5 times	2.50
6 times	3.00
7 times	3.50
8 times	4.00
9 times	4.50
10 times	5.00
11 times	5.50
12 times	6.00
13 times	6.50
14 times	7.00
15 times	7.50
16 times	8.00
17 times	8.50
18 times	9.00
19 times	9.50
20 times	10.00
21 times	10.50
22 times	11.00
23 times	11.50
24 times	12.00
25 times	12.50
26 times	13.00
27 times	13.50
28 times	14.00
29 times	14.50
30 times	15.00
31 times	15.50
32 times	16.00
33 times	16.50
34 times	17.00
35 times	17.50
36 times	18.00
37 times	18.50
38 times	19.00
39 times	19.50
40 times	20.00
41 times	20.50
42 times	21.00
43 times	21.50
44 times	22.00
45 times	22.50
46 times	23.00
47 times	23.50
48 times	24.00
49 times	24.50
50 times	25.00
51 times	25.50
52 times	26.00
53 times	26.50
54 times	27.00
55 times	27.50
56 times	28.00
57 times	28.50
58 times	29.00
59 times	29.50
60 times	30.00
61 times	30.50
62 times	31.00
63 times	31.50
64 times	32.00
65 times	32.50
66 times	33.00
67 times	33.50
68 times	34.00
69 times	34.50
70 times	35.00
71 times	35.50
72 times	36.00
73 times	36.50
74 times	37.00
75 times	37.50
76 times	38.00
77 times	38.50
78 times	39.00
79 times	39.50
80 times	40.00
81 times	40.50
82 times	41.00
83 times	41.50
84 times	42.00
85 times	42.50
86 times	43.00
87 times	43.50
88 times	44.00
89 times	44.50
90 times	45.00
91 times	45.50
92 times	46.00
93 times	46.50
94 times	47.00
95 times	47.50
96 times	48.00
97 times	48.50
98 times	49.00
99 times	49.50
100 times	50.00

Reading notices in reading-matter type, five lines or less, \$1; in nonpareil, leaded, five lines or less, 75 cents.

Card of rates for more space furnished on application.

All letters and telegrams must be addressed to THE DISPATCH COMPANY.

Rejected communications will not be returned.

All letters recommending candidates for office must be paid for to insure their publication. This is a long standing rule of ours.

Resolutions of respect to deceased members passed by societies, corporations, associations, or other organizations will be charged for as advertising matter.

UP-TOWN OFFICE, BROAD-STREET PHARMACY, 53 EAST BROAD STREET.

WEST-END OFFICE, PARK-PLACE PHARMACY, BELVIDERE AND MAIN STREETS.

MANCHESTER OFFICE, 123 HULL STREET.

THURSDAY.....APRIL 8, 1897.

### DEMOCRATS WIDE AWAKE.

The Democratic party is far from being dead. All the obituaries upon it have been premature. Nevertheless, they have served a good purpose. They have deceived the enemy, and the consequence is that the enemy are ours in many places out West.

These victories, coming upon Republican losses which occurred in New England and New York a month ago, go to show that "confidence is restored" in the Democratic party. Indeed, we may say that though the money and ingenuity of Mr. Hanna made the fact appear otherwise, the people did not lose confidence in us last year. Many votes were constrained on that occasion, and many of our wandering brethren have seized the very first opportunity that they have had to turn their backs upon Republicanism.

Our victories this week were spread over a large extent of territory, though the greatest of them were won in Chicago and in the States of Ohio, Michigan, and Kansas. Furthermore, the testimony comes from unimpeachable sources that not "local politics only" figured in these elections. No, indeed. Without a question the people are already disgusted with McKinleyism.

In the first place, they were told that the trouble with the country was "a lack of confidence." We were assured that the defeat of Bryan and the election of McKinley would instantly restore confidence. It did not do so. But worse than this disappointment is the positive wrong done the country by the proposed Dingley tariff.

Here we have a tariff so sectional, unfair, and extortionate that outrages against it are heard even in New England. And on top of the Dingley disgrace we have the Grosvener amendment, by which it is proposed to make the Dingley duties retrospective. Next we have the Secretary of the Treasury issuing orders to prepare to enforce the Dingley bill before it becomes a law.

So we must say that our wandering brethren have ample reasons for returning to the Democratic party. The truth is that thousands of them left us very unwillingly last fall, and being now free from restraint they joyfully take their places in the ranks where they have always fought.

We cannot but believe from the elections that have taken place this year that if we could go into a general election now we would rout the enemy, "horse, foot, and dragons." We have the same faith in local elections that Sammy Tilden had. He was right in saying that if you will watch how the "town" elections go, you will be able to forecast the politics of the country as a whole. Mr. Tilden used the word "town" in the New England sense, meaning "township," which includes not only the small towns, but the country districts adjacent.

The truth is, the people of these United States are disgusted and disappointed with the party in power. Many of them were led to believe that it was only necessary to defeat Mr. Bryan to restore the country to prosperity.

Well, Mr. Bryan was defeated, but with the results of McKinley's election before the people, Bryan is to-day a more popular man than McKinley.

The elections of this week have done much to hearten Democrats. Our victories give proof that our grand old party is very much alive and exceedingly vigorous. Furthermore, business will be helped by our victory. How? Why, the spectre of Billy Bryan and his 16-to-1 banner has already come before the Republicans' eyes again, and these fellows are ready to rush themselves to death almost to hasten legislation which will "down" the dreaded visitor. These victories of ours will assuredly spur the Republicans to do their best, and cannot but strengthen the hands of conservative Republican senators. In fine, we are confident they will expedite action upon the tariff.

The result of the recent general elections in Italy indicate troublesome times ahead there. It shows a distinct and significant increase in the anti-monarchical supporters, and the position of the government is admitted to be much weaker than it was before going to the election. The situation is thus described: "The situation is thus described: of the constitution, groups, that of Signor Zanardelli, which borders on Republicanism, is the only one which has gained ground; that of Signor Giolitti, which is next removed from Radicalism, remains the same; that of Signor Crispi, has lost several of its most important members, while the avowed Republicans and Socialists have gained largely. The group of Signor Cavallotti is about as strong as it was in the late Chamber, but serious dissensions seem to have arisen between Signor Cavallotti and the avowed Republican and Socialist groups. In view of these facts it is confidently predicted that the Ministry will be forced to follow the Chamber instead of leading it.

Many of our State exchanges are engaged in discussing the question whether our next State convention should be a large or a small one. This is well. It is better to have the subject considered in advance of the meeting of the State Committee, so that the committee may be guided by popular sentiment so far as practicable.

Against having a convention of 1,000 members instead of one of 800, it is argued that the former cannot in any true sense be called a deliberative body. Further, it is contended that to order a big convention would narrow the committee's choice of places of meeting for the convention, since there are many cities that could entertain a small convention but could not entertain a big one. Altogether, it is believed by the advocates of a small convention that the sessions of such a body would be much more satisfactory than those of a big convention could possibly be.

On the other hand, it is said that a convention of 800 men would be no more deliberative than one of 1,000. In either event the convention (except in the matter of voting for nominees) would have to depend very much upon its committee.

Again, it is urged that a big convention affords just twice the opportunity that a small one does to interest and reward good party-workers.

In every city and county there are numbers of men, old and young, who are never candidates for office, and who ask no favor from the party other than an opportunity to serve in its State and district conventions. In all of the discussions that have taken place upon the subject in the State Committee this argument has proved most potent.

As an original proposition, it may be that our party would have better limited its conventions to 800 men. Then a dozen cities could have been competitors for convention honors where the choice has been limited to a few. But now the custom of having large conventions may be considered as established, and we doubt that it will be difficult to make a change.

Virginia people are great sticklers for precedent, and the fact that our big conventions have pretty generally done their work well is an argument that will doubtless be employed with much force. But let us be suspected by some of a desire to narrow the committee's choice so that Richmond may have a better chance to secure the next convention, we repeat what we have said more than once, that in our belief Richmond will heartily invite the committee to send the convention here, but will bring no sort of pressure to bear upon the committee to influence its action.

After talking with many persons, we take this to be the sentiment of the Democrats of this city. So, really, it is not a matter of consequence to us whether a big convention or a small convention be ordered.

The State Committee, we take it for granted, would be very glad to have this subject fully discussed in advance of its meeting. If it could ascertain the trend of party opinion, its path of duty would be plain.

What all good Democrats desire is that our convention shall be well attended and shall be thoroughly representative of our party. If so, whether it be composed of 800 or of 1,000 members, we may rely upon it that its work will give satisfaction and will prepare the way for a great Democratic victory.

### ITS DANGER.

Acting upon the suggestion of President McKinley in a special message to Congress, that body yesterday passed a joint resolution appropriating \$200,000 for the relief of the southern and western flood-sufferers. The President was right in saying there are precedents for such an appropriation, but Mr. Walker (Republican), of Massachusetts, was doubtless equally right in declaring that there is no constitutional warrant for it.

Appropriations of this character partake of paternalism, and are against the spirit of our institutions, even should it be found that they do not violate the letter of the organic law. However, Congress could hardly infringe upon the Constitution for a better cause, and certainly, several times since the war paternalism has assumed a much more flagrant and obnoxious form than in the present instance.

Under the circumstances, no one ought to object to the appropriation in itself. There is no harm in it, considered in that light. On the contrary, it is to be applauded. But it is dangerous as an other precedent, and there is no telling to what lengths in the matter of trampling the Constitution under foot the piling up of precedents may finally lead.

The New York Evening Post says that "the more Mr. Dingley's concession of free books and apparatus for the use of colleges is examined, the more it seems either an intended bit of trickery or a provision so carelessly drawn as to prove practically nugatory." What else did the Post expect? If the "concession" was not one or the other of these, it would be entirely out of harmony with the rest of the bill.

Greek independence anniversary-day proved as disappointing in respect of furnishing real live, exciting news, as usually does the dreaded May-day on the Continent. The expected didn't happen. There were eruptions on the Fourth of July order at Athens and other points in Greece, but the much-predicted clash of arms between the Hellenes and Turks on the border failed ignominiously to materialize.

New York business-men are moving in the way of issuing special invitations to tradesmen and merchants all over the country to attend the dedication of the Grant monument, and afterwards buy goods. Ten-day excursion tickets are being arranged for.

Sultan of Zanzibar has issued a decree abolishing slavery, compensation being allowed for all slaves legally held. He seems to have gone about the matter in the right way.

Senator Morgan's voice is still for war with Spain over the Cuban question.

### OUR EXPENSE ACCOUNT.

When we talk about cutting down the expenses of the State Government, let us examine the list and see which one of the following items we would reduce:

Public schools.....	\$50,000
Universities, institutes, seminaries, and colleges.....	300,000
Interest on public debt.....	600,000
Care of lunatics.....	313,000
Pensions, etc.....	140,000
Support of government.....	740,000

There are other items, but they are not of great consequence. These are the chief fixed expenses of Virginia.

In the second item on the list, we include more than \$100,000 of "excess of interest" on State bonds, which is usually included in the interest account.

The \$313,000 spent for the care of lunatics might be reduced very considerably if saddled upon the counties and cities, as they would be more careful than the State to recover their expenses out of the estates of the insane, where such estates exist.

About one half of the sum that we put down for the "support of government" goes for criminal expenses. This sum might be considerably reduced if the habit of continuing cases had not such a strong hold upon the Virginia courts—or upon some of the Virginia courts, we would better say.

Possibly some of the court charges that are now put upon the State might be safely put upon the several counties and cities. At present there are counties that draw out of Virginia's Treasury for criminal expenses, and for schools more than all of the taxes they pay in. But to compel each county to pay all of its criminal expenses might sometimes result in the defeat of justice. Rather than burden themselves with the expenses of a great criminal trial, the people might be inclined either to let the criminal go scot-free, or else lynch him.

In considering criminal charges we must remember, however, that we have a net profit of about \$9,000 per annum from the hire of penitentiary convicts. All these things we should consider when we go to figuring upon Virginia's expenses and how those expenses might be reduced by the Legislature or by a constitutional convention.

It seems quite certain that in many counties an era of retrenchment and reform would begin at once if the counties were made to assume some of the charges now assumed and paid by the State.

A Cleveland telegram is as follows: "The name 'Klansman' has a peculiar sound, while pleasant to the ear, has proved objectionable to the young ladies residing thereon, and so a number of them have called on the City Board of Control with a petition signed by all the fair ones on the street, asking that the name be changed."

It is presumed that the young ladies in question do not wish to be confined to the privilege of Klansman only. They are, doubtless, of the opinion that "there are others" than Sam, though we venture to say that they do not count Sam out altogether, either. Klansman street sounds too exclusive, that's all.

"The mild weather has precipitated the most remarkable flow of maple sap ever known in Vermont." And the buckwheat to provide cakes for the same is doing well also, we understand.

Chicago has good reason now to crow over St. Louis. The Lake City has gone Democratic. The Mississippi Valley metropolis is in the hands of the Republicans.

The little Eastern question is becoming still smaller by degrees, and beautifully less. The eventuation is a happy one.

Senator Morgan would have Senator Hale to understand that he is as hale as Hale can be.

The Dingley bill gives promise of being a first-rate Democratic campaign document.

Wouldn't Wear One Even to Attend the President's Dinner.

(Interview in Washington Correspondence of the New York World.)

Mr. Bailey was not averse to talking about his dress-suit episode, but he did resent any criticism that such styles are not known down in Texas.

"The people here in New York are more provincial than those down in my district," he said. "Whenever I walk along the street they turn and look at my broad-brimmed hat with curiosity. You never meet a Texan doing that. New Yorkers imagine that every other place is provincial, and that they are the only correctly dressed people."

"Down in my district there are plenty of people who wear dress suits, and often, too. They don't stare at a man, no matter what sort of clothes he wears. It seems to me that the company they should criticize what I wear. I was not sent to Washington to be the leader of fashion."

"As to this dinner given by the President to me simply this, Mr. McKinley and I are good friends, and when I received the invitation to dinner at the White House I went to him and explained that I could not attend because I would not wear a dress suit. 'Come as you are,' he urged, but I stuck to my position. While I hold that every man has a right to wear what he chooses, I do not think it is right to make one's self conspicuous by being the one out of forty who is not practically in uniform."

NO TIME FOR FASHIONS.

"So far as I am concerned, this wearing of dress clothes is entirely a matter of taste. I consider it time wasted putting on a dress suit and going around dining with people. It might be better spent in study."

"I can't afford the time for that sort of thing. Now, I wouldn't be Secretary of State or Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, because, for one reason, I would have to wear a dress suit. I would rather be a plain congressman. There is an etiquette about those places that would have to be maintained."

"But if you were made President, what would you do?"

"Well, that's different. If I were President I suppose I would have to wear one, but that's a long way off." And Mr. Bailey laughed. Then he added: "No man should allow a dress suit to stand between him and the presidency."

"The only time I ever wore a dress suit was a number of years ago at a wedding down in Mississippi, when the Governor's daughter got married. It

was agreed that if the other men in the wedding party could get clothed, I like mine they would dress my way; if not, I was to dress like them. So I wore a suit of all gray frock coats, and I wore for a little while a dress coat that they had brought along for me. That was the first and last time.

"I consider the social side of Washington a good deal of a nuisance. The demands on a man's time are too great. Repeated dining out burns out a man's mind, and he goes home unfitted for his duties. It is not necessary to go to dinner to discuss matters of public policy. For my part I don't care to be appealed to through my stomach. A man who goes at a subject by way of his stomach is sure to be on the wrong side."

DOESN'T CARE FOR SOCIETY.

"I think our fathers had this social position in mind when they located the capital of the nation away by itself. They did not want it in a large city, where the social temptation for legislators is so great. The legislators of to-day and the young men have to study, and they have no time to waste in putting on dress-suits and dining out if they are going to devote themselves properly to their books."

"At the same time, I believe it is pleasant and profitable to dine with friends in the home way. When my constituents come to Washington—and lots of them wear dress-suits—I say, 'Come over to the tavern and dine with me,' and we have a quiet dinner."

"My prejudice against a dress-suit has grown largely out of habit, I suppose, as most of our prejudices do. I don't like to have people tell me what I shall wear. Clothes do not make the man."

"The fact is, I do not care to attend social functions. I have not the time to spare. I realize that a man of 50, who has learned everything there is to know, may waste his time in a large city, but to a young man just entering upon his political career, who has much work to do, it is different."

"It is incredible how out of many patent social functions, I have not the time to spare. I realize that a man of 50, who has learned everything there is to know, may waste his time in a large city, but to a young man just entering upon his political career, who has much work to do, it is different."

"I am tired of the social side of Washington. I don't see how the Cabinet ministers find time to attend to their duties. They may take up the papers and see that Cabinet officers have been each others' guests almost every night. Of course, to men whose whole time is spent in attending to their duties, dining with colleagues or dancing with society ladies, dressing may be an essential to political life. To mine, they are not."

Striving to Please.

(Indianapolis Journal.)

"One of our oldest subscribers," said the foreman, mailing clerk, and advertising solicitor of the Plunkville Bugle, has written to say that he wouldn't be found dead with our mealy sheet on him."

"We've got to win him back," said the editor. "Put in an ad. to the effect that we will give \$5 accident insurance to the heirs of any man who dies with a current copy of our paper about his clothes."

Why He Left It.

(Twinkles.)

Hobbs: Why did the cashier leave the country?

Dobbs: The only reason was that he couldn't take it with him.

The Picture.

(Youth's Companion.)

There is a picture in my room.

No stranger eyes shall ever see.

Pit food for mirth to him, perhaps, A holy think to me.

She labored in a barren land.

Barren of hills or river shore;

Barren of woods or prairie sweeps;

Small things about her door.

Her face was brown with sun and toil;

Her eyes were truthful, clear, and gray;

Her hands were firm and fixed to work

Through all the changeless day.

Between the tasks she painted it.

A child's cheap paint-box all she had;

The drawing, color, you would say,

A surely, wholly laid.

But she who held the wretched brush,

In hand but used to wield a broom,

Put all her starving soul in this,

Her love of bird and bloom.

She saw a faint, gold, sunset sky;

That glorified the brooding hills;

She saw the river still and wide

Like to a soul God's presence fills.

She saw the birds flit silently

Homeward against that tender light;

She felt the fragrance of the rose

Before the dew of night.

Deep feelings made her heart grow great;

Grew great within her, as she wrought.

What if the hand that held the brush

Was rigid, and untalented?

The poor, pathetic, faded daub,

With the cheap tints and shabby lines,

Grown glorious in her master's glance

When once the eye divine.

I, who have tried in halting rhyme,

To tell the things my soul would see,

Had it away from scornful eyes,

A holy thing to me.

MARGARET GILMAN GEORGE.

### A Great Game of Chess.

(Baltimore American.)

There